UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Religion and the Cultural Evolution of Man - - - - - - - *Gardner Williams*

Faith and Skepticism - - - - - - - - - - - *Bhabes Chandra Chaudhuri*

My Humanism - - - - *William Yerington*

The Problem of Evil - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXL No. 5

Chicago, January-February, 1955

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly *Subscription $1.50*

Except During July-August *Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

Bhabes Chandra Chaudhuri: Resident of India.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Gardner Williams: Professor in the University of Toledo.

William Yerington: Professor Emeritus of Syracuse University.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 67

ARTICLES—

Religion and the Cultural Evolution of Man—Gardner Williams 68

Faith and Skepticism—Bhabes Chandra Chaudhuri 72

My Humanism—William Yerington 74

The Problem of Evil—Leo Hirsch 76

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 79

THE FIELD—

Your World—Devere Allen, *Worldover Press* 66

THE FIELD

Your World

All over the world, the press has been commenting on the change that appears to have come about in American foreign policy, as voiced by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. It is natural that the foreign press should have been quicker to note the extent of the shift, for people abroad have long been fearful of the previous policy, while they greet the new one with relief and praise.

Maybe it won't last, and complete consistency cannot be expected. But the change is conspicuous. A little while ago, Mr. Dulles was talking about "liberation," "massive retaliation," and "agonizing reappraisal," and advocates of a "preventive war" drew few rebukes. Only by the skin of its teeth did the United States resist those who urged its entrance into the Indo-China war, such as Vice President Nixon and Admiral Radford. Regularly, the White House and State Department appeased the extremists in the Republican right wing and Democrats like the late Mr. McCarran.

What a difference now! An American President thinks it important to note publicly a more conciliatory attitude by Moscow. Mr. Dulles drops his favorite calisthenics and no longer wallops his allies. Preventive war is forthrightly condemned. And although Washington insists, as do the other signers of the London Pact, that the agreement be ratified before negotiations with Russia, no longer is the United States demanding that it must get all it wants in advance before talking. In the U.N., both the Russians and the Americans have shown encouraging, if minor, evidences of a new moderation.

What produced this shift? You won't read much about it yet, but West European intelligence services confirmed American judgments that a genuine change has taken place in Soviet methods. This, substantially, is what Ambassador Bohlen reported: "Peaceful co-existence" as Russia sees it does not mean giving up propaganda, infiltration, or basic

(*Continued on page* 78)

UNITY

VOLUME CXL JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1955 No. 5

EDITORIAL

On February 12, Lincoln's birthday, Abraham Lincoln Centre celebrated its 50th Anniversary. The Centre was founded in 1905 by Jenkin Lloyd Jones and his associates in All Souls Church. Dr. Jones had served in the Union Army during the war between the states. He was a great admirer of Abraham Lincoln and thoroughly devoted to democratic principles. So, when he sought a name for an institution to be dedicated to human service without regard to race, creed, color, age, sex, or political opinion, it was natural for him to come up with the name Abraham Lincoln Centre. For one-half century the Centre has pioneered in race relations, and in freedom of speech, press, and assembly. While originally established in a practically all white neighborhood, the Centre had no difficulty in adjusting to a completely changed neighborhood. The liberal background of the Centre, its chartered purpose, the free spirit of the Board of Directors, and the democracy of its leadership guaranteed that the Centre would not waver when its principles were challenged by changes in its environing situation. With its history and principles there was no necessity for changes in policy to meet changes in the surrounding population. The new neighbors were human beings, and that was all that counted. The dire consequences often predicted when an institution or a person acts in accordance with basic democratic principles rarely follow. The Centre consistently practices a policy of racially mixed residents, racially mixed staff, and racially mixed clientele. The program emphasis throughout the years has been on things cultural, sociological, and democratic. Program techniques have been only instruments in the service of these larger goals. During the fifty years of the Centre's existence, more than 7,000,000 people have passed through its doors, and the Centre's intangible influence on their lives is incalculable. The Centre has become known far and wide as a meeting place for all sorts of civic, liberal, and cultural groups. The fact that Abraham Lincoln Centre could weather the storms of a half-century, that it has devotedly and successfully practiced the principles of democracy is evidence that democracy on a universal scale is not an impossible dream. The need is simply for an increasing number of people to follow the example of the founders and managers of Abraham Lincoln Centre. When this is done there is every reason to expect that a wide response will be found in the hearts and lives of an ever-increasing number of people everywhere, until the human race shall become one human family bound together by the bonds of human brotherhood.

Curtis W. Reese.

Religion and the Cultural Evolution of Man

GARDNER WILLIAMS

I am deeply impressed both with the glories and with the crimes of religion. It has helped, and it has hindered man. Its help has been indispensable. Civilization is founded upon religion. Its hindrances have not been fatal to all civilization—yet! Can we make it help without hindering? I say that in time we might make it help greatly, and hinder hardly at all. But every human activity and institution will do some harm.

Religion has done evil in three different ways; and it still does evil in these ways.

(1) Corrupt priesthoods play the game of power politics in order to enhance their own wealth and social influence, often neglecting the spiritual needs of the people, and interfering with the proper conduct of government.

(2) Religions have been intolerant and bigoted. They have tortured and killed heretics who thought independently, and they have slaughtered the members of rival sects who thought differently.

(3) Religions have taught false theories about the nature of man and of the universe. They have battled against science and against a true rational understanding of ultimate principles. Orthodox sects today seek to suppress scientific knowledge because they fear that it will cause them to lose most of their dues-paying members.

Orthodox organized religion, then, is in large measure corrupt and fraudulent, and most of its ideas are false. I like almost everything else about it. I like its moral idealism, its poetical rituals, its music, its architecture, and the fine social fellowship which it often achieves. But its blemishes lead many sincere and intelligent people to repudiate it and all religion completely. They say, we can live better, and respect ourselves more, without religion. Some of my friends in the American Humanist Association take this view. And I try to enlighten them about the essential inspirational role which religion plays in human society. Organized religion is a natural social institution which teaches about ideals and inspires people with an enthusiasm to attain them. Civilization now and always depends upon the inspirational idealism of religion, whether derived from churches, families, other social institutions, or individuals. So let us not seek to abolish religion completely. Rather let us try to correct the evils of corrupt power, intolerance, and falsehood, by education, enlightenment, and democracy—democracy both in the political state and in church organization. That is what Unitarianism and, at its best, Humanism aim to do.

But can we save the real essentials of religion without any falsehood whatever? That is an issue about which an important controversy hinges. My answer is "Yes," and this paper is an explanation of my answer.

I think that at some early stages in the development of civilization, falsehood was good. Let us look for a moment at how religion operated in the first civilizations. Next we shall turn to the aberrations of traditional Christian theology itself. And finally let us consider what, in our tradition, enlightened people may accept, and what they should do about the religious problem.

In ancient Egypt the Pharaoh was said to be the son of the sun god, Ammon-Ra. Poor farmers, most of whom never saw the king, and some of whom lived hundreds of miles away from his capital city, were willing to pay taxes to him, and to obey his laws, because he was a god. To refuse would be atheism. Of course they paid partly because they would have been executed if they did not. Civilization is based upon armed force as well as on religion. It is also based upon agriculture. Unless a considerable portion of the population are farmers or fishermen, there will not be enough food for those in a civilized community who produce no food. Moreover, civilization is based in part upon the division of labor. Each individual specializes upon a very small part of the process of economic production and of other social work. Without this specialization of function, production would not be very efficient.

Civilization, then, is based upon at least four things: (1) Religion, (2) Force, (3) Agriculture, and (4) The Division of Labor.

I am now concentrating upon the contribution of religion to civilization. Religion must stir in people an enthusiasm for the ideals of orderly civilized life, and inspire each one to make his small specialized contribution to the organized whole of society, upon which everyone depends for nearly everything of value in life. Above all, the people must love their political institutions if these are to endure. There must be a willingness to cooperate. Should all of the citizens hate the government, it will not last many centuries. Rome fell when nearly everybody hated it.

The real reason why, from their own points of view, the farmers should perform their civic duties, was (and is) that doing so strengthened a political system in which they found security from violence, some measure of prosperity, and the promise of a stable and orderly life for their children. But if you had urged these reasons upon the peasants of ancient Egypt, in order to make them do their duty, they would probably do something else. They were very ignorant. Especially when powerful leaders were creating the earliest civilizations, those ignorant barbarians who became engulfed within the confines of the civilized state would not be likely to appreciate the advantages to themselves of the new legal restrictions and exactions; which in fact were primarily for the benefit of a rich and powerful aristocracy who lived in luxury, while the peasants toiled at heavy tasks for a bare livelihood. But if the peasants could be convinced that the one who instigated and administered the system was a god in human form, they would be more willing, and so more likely, to submit. Probably the early civilizations could not have been maintained without some such theological ideology as this. Every one of them had something of this nature.

Also, in Japan, the Emperor Hirohito used to be the 124th direct descendant of the sun goddess Amaterasu, the patron deity of the Japanese people. Since January 1, 1946, he has had only a human ancestry.

I need not argue that pharoahs and emperors really are only human. Civilization is based upon falsehood. These intellectual aberrations were necessary in order to give prosperity, stability, and long life to civilized

government, and thus to permit and encourage the slow development of education, of science, and of enlightenment, so that many people in later ages could understand how things really work in society and in the universe at large, and could see through the more or less benevolent frauds of the theologians and politicians.

All of the original religions of the ancient states were sacrificial. There was a temple which was the dwelling place of the god, who had a particular and local existence. That temple was his home, and he stayed there most of the time. He had his meals there. People brought food. A farmer would bring him a goat. The priests killed the goat on the altar and perhaps burned the carcass. Thereby it was thought that the deity was nourished, and was satisfied, and would use his great supernatural powers to help the man who supplied the goat, by making the weather more favorable to grow fodder, and by making his herds multiply more prolifically. The farmer sacrificed one goat, perhaps every few months, and thereby secured an increase in his stock, which more than compensated him for his loss. The god's favor was won by small sacrifices intended to bring greater goods.

The sacrifice was a genuinely religious act, in that it symbolized the basic spiritual truth that man is often called upon to sacrifice his immediate good and desire, in order to attain the greater good and greater desire in the long run. The pursuit of great ideals and the maintenance of standards require and justify sacrifices. Probably no spiritual beings were induced, by the killing of goats, to help mankind. The ideology is seen now to have been false. But the inspiration and spiritual idealism were socially helpful. The farmer who sacrificed properly, in accordance with the religious customs of his country, got on better in life because he had more confidence. However, he had it only because he believed in a false theory of how things operate in this universe.

A sacrificial religion is almost always confined to a small geographical area. The god is worshipped in one temple, or in a few temples. He cannot be worshipped elsewhere.

In contrast to the sacrificial type of religion, all the great powerful international religions of the modern world are literary. All have sacred books, or Bibles, in which the divine truths are written. Church services are the study and expression of these truths, not the killing of lambs or goats on an altar. All literary religions have grown out of sacrificial ones. The ancient Hebrew priesthood kept slaughtering goats and sheep until 70 A.D., when the Romans destroyed the temple after a revolt, and slaughtered the priesthood. Later the Romans built a temple to Jupiter on the site of the former temple to Jehovah. But long before its annihilation, the priesthood had begun the canonization of the Old Testament. That is, they thought they needed some sacred books; so they wrote or found a number of appropriate volumes, and blessed them, sanctified them, canonized them, and made them religiously official. Deuteronomy was the first. These books expressed their religious ideas, and were interpreted to the people by scholars called rabbis, chiefly in synagogues which grew up only after about 600 B.C. during the Babylonian Captivity.

Even in 700 B.C., before the canonization, as is shown in the book of Isaiah, some Hebrew prophets were saying that God is a universal spiritual power, and is not just localized in his own home temple. This idea became widely accepted later in the synagogue worship. In the diaspora or dispersion of Jewish communities to many nations outside of Israel, synagogues were formed, and wherever two or three of the chosen people were gathered together to study the holy word, the Lord was with them.

This literary religion is Judaism. The older Hebrew sacrificial religion ceased after 70 A.D., and I am informed that it is not being revived in Israel today.

Christianity is a literary religion which is an outgrowth of Judaism. It is just a Jewish heresy. Its congregational worship is modeled after the synagogue. God is a universal spirit, but the monotheism of orthodox Christianity is modified by the doctrine of the Trinity. There are three persons, which look like three Gods. One is the father, something like Zeus in Greek religion. And he seems superior to the other two, in spite of denials by leading Athanasian theologians.

Man, on this theory, is very sinful. There is his original sin, inherited from Adam. And then there have been other sins committed all along the way. God created man with an inferior nature, incapable of resisting strong temptations, and incapable of living by pure love and virtue. But God is, nevertheless, in a state of more or less repressed fury most of the time because man sins, in accordance with man's imperfect nature which God has given him.

At one stage in world history, so runs the story, God's divine wrath reached such proportions that he was on the point of damning the whole human species to eternal hellfire. His wrath craved sadistic expression, and apparently it did not matter much toward whom it should be directed. All mankind would do, or God's own son, Jesus, would do. Jesus, a god, though a slightly minor one, would be about equivalent to all mankind, and Jesus offered to undergo the penalties which men had earned for themselves, and which had to be imposed, according to the eternal law of retribution established by God the Father. So the divine son suffered on the cross for the sins of all humanity. However, he did not burn for long in the fires of hell, as men would have done had He not made his great sacrifice. He was soon sitting upon his heavenly throne again, taking part in the administration of the affairs of the universe.

The suffering he did undergo was the sacrifice to end all sacrifices, and those who believed that it was, would be saved by it, without killing any more goats or lambs. Jesus was the Lamb of God sacrificed on the cross to atone for the sins of the world. This orthodox tradition is stated very clearly in Milton's *Paradise Lost,* Book 3, lines 203-343.

This seems to me to be a horrible theory of divine sadism. And it is utterly contrary to fact. Yet it is the central principle of traditional orthodox Christian theology.

It is so bad that theologians today will not state it clearly. They often tell us just that God loves us all, and that He will take care of us if we are good. But if that is so, why did Jesus have to suffer on the cross. The crucifixion is a fact of history, though the resurrection is not. And why should only those people be given eternal glory in the next world who believe that he did this for them? And why have millions of men suffered such agony in this earthly life? And why were thousands of victims executed by crucifixion, by the Romans, for opposing Roman public policies?

In spite of the difficulties involved in theological doctrines, the Graeco-Judaeo-Christian religious tradition of the West has sponsored the genuine ideals of love, kindness, and justice, which Jesus taught. Christianity is a mixture of good and evil. Partly it is a true religion. All religions are true religions. All teach devotion to great ideals. Christianity has inspired the tremendous achievements of Western Civilization. Housed in its magnificent cathedrals and in its smaller gem-like edifices, and supported by the voluntary or forced contributions of millions of people, it is the official expression of the idealism of modern Western society.

But great numbers of people today, with some knowledge of science and history, and with some powers of independent rational thought, can see the absurdity and falsehood in its official creeds, which originated in those early pre-scientific eras.

We have today in Western Civilization a strong cultural tradition of fictitious but inspirational theology, and also a tradition of rational scientific knowledge. The science would not be with us if there had not been long ages of orderly civilized prosperity based in the first place upon fictitious theology. But, due to the complex and somewhat paradoxical processes of cultural history, we are confronted with both genuine uninspiring truth and inspirational falsehood. This conflict and tension in our social culture forces a corresponding conflict upon many individuals. As a modern youth matures out of childhood, religion is presented to him as man's only guide to the ultimate good. The right thing in every situation is what God expects and commands. But when the youth studies science and learns to use reason, he finds that the creedal accounts of God seem to be contrary to fact. Then, in order to hold with what is good, youth must embrace falsehood. And in order to lay hold on what is true, youth must turn away from the ultimate good as officially expressed in orthodox religion.

Our contemporary culture forces this tragic spiritual conflict upon thousands of young people, and older people. But man demands both the true and the good. The true is indeed part of the good. It is one kind of good. And often, in contemporary society, a man must not tell the truth if he is to eat, live with his family, and hold his friends.

Many a youngster, if he tells the truth about the natural biological evolutionary development of man, and about how the universe operates by natural law, which he may learn in high-school or college, will precipitate a family crisis or hurt his standing among those with whom he works or plays or worships. Our culture is now organized so as to make spiritual dishonesty necessary for very many enlightened persons, including many leaders in orthodox churches who do not believe their own creeds. Civilization is based on falsehood. And the task of Unitarianism is to give it a new foundation in truth.

We must seek to strengthen our present Unitarian cultural tradition, expand it, and make it the possession of all mankind in the future, so that the great spiritual principles of true religion will be presented without hypocrisy, and in such a way as not to contradict any facts indicated by science, reason, or experience.

And here I look to scientific Humanism to help us, as it has been organized, partly within the Unitarian tradition. I am a humanistic Unitarian, and I wish that more Unitarians were humanistic. But still, Unitarianism itself must remain non-creedal. It invites each member to believe what he thinks is true. And I really think that most of the principles of modern scientific Humanism are true.

One of the basic ideas of Humanism is Naturalism. This means that we repudiate the notion of miracles and of supernatural occurrences. All events are caused in accordance with uniform natural law, which is not planned to serve human welfare. Sometimes men plan events to serve human welfare, and carry out their plans, but the universe itself does not plan. In one sense Humanists are less humanistic than the orthodox theologians, who interpret the universe as being purposively guided to benefit mankind. In his last autobiographical volume, entitled *My Host the World,* George Santayana said that very early in life he realized that the universe is inhuman. And all his subsequent experience corroborated this belief. Most Humanists agree that the cosmos is inhuman. Man himself has the responsibility for creating and preserving the good life for himself and for his fellow men, by kindness, by Christian or human love, by justice, intelligence, and courage. There are creative evolutionary forces which help. But intentional help comes to man from himself and from his fellows. At times a dog will try to help his master.

Good and evil are interpreted by Humanists in terms of the natural human experiences of happiness and suffering. Right and wrong are known, not by supernatural revelation, but by natural human reason, on the basis of natural human experience.

Humanists are concerned for human welfare in this world. They do not think of this our life as a disciplinary preparation for an eternal life of bliss or torment, as the case may be.

Official orthodox Humanism (and there is such a thing) is skeptical about the theological notions of God and the supreme being, but I am an heretical Humanist in my view that the term "God," while it may have many meanings, most of which are contrary to fact, still has one minimum and essential meaning which involves no falsehood, and is indispensable in religion and in the life of man. This meaning is "the principle of man's highest good." That God is the highest good has been asserted by Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, Santayana, Dewey, and many others. God is the principle of divinity. God is not an omnipotent force, and is not necessarily any force at all. It is a principle of perfection having an absolute logico-spiritual validity. It is that, and that alone, to which, without any qualification whatever, man can give the last full measure of devotion. It is the ideal of the highest good. It is that which is most deeply satisfactory in the long run to an individual.

And I think that this spiritual principle should be contrasted with what may properly be called the supreme being or ultimate and basic reality of the universe, the substantial core of nature. I do not mean that it is a personal being. The word "being" is the present participle of the verb "to be," and the term "supreme being" stands just for what ultimately is or exists. Modern physics indicates that the substantial core of nature, the ultimate reality of the universe, is structured energy. Matter is one form of energy; electro-magnetic waves or quanta are another. Man is a complex biological organism made up of chemical elements functioning so as to have spiritual qualities or attributes, such as culture, conscious purpose, kind-

ness, a devotion to truth, a passion for justice, free-will, moral responsibility, and an appreciation of beauty. All these are products, not causes, of the biological evolution of man. They are results of man's biological life, not the forces which created it.

The true essence of religion is the love of God. It is an active devotion to the ideal of man's highest good. Organized religion is a social institution. It is the guide of willing men to their highest goals. Its function is to supply humanity with inspiration, social corroboration in good works, and admonition. It teaches ideals and stirs enthusiasm for them. Its services and rituals express devotion and aspiration to God, the principle of the highest good, which is never fully actualized. God is never incarnate. Religious rituals and practices give expression to resignation in inevitable defeat, consolation in sorrow, repentance for errors, and forgiveness, and the celebration of spiritual triumphs. They also express pious gratitude to the supreme being for all our blessings. They involve nothing but natural social and individual psychological processes.

But true religion is not the worship of the supreme being. That ultimate substance of the whole cosmos has unintentionally produced all the evils as well as all the blessings. It has produced everything, good and evil. Whatever does evil, even indirectly, is to that extent evil. The supreme being is partly evil. The worship of evil is idolatrous. God and the supreme being are utterly different sorts of things. The chief metaphysical error of orthodox theology is to regard them as identical.

Prayer is a soliloquy in which we remind ourselves of the ultimate good and ideal, the principle of divinity; and we renew our devotion to it, so that later on it may not be wholly ignored or violated in the thick of active living.

I see Unitarianism as holding up a torch of spiritual truth and inspiration which other denominations will gradually follow as more people become educated and enlightened. But people are not going to leave the other sects in great numbers to join us. They are going to transform their own groups more into the pattern of Unitarianism, without using that label. This is happening now in many churches where people are better educated. And this will happen more and more as the centuries roll by, if prosperity is not overthrown by a global war, or by a bang-up inflation and depression. If civilization collapses and we return to the cultural level of primitive savages, all bets are off. But I do not expect this to happen.

I see mankind remolding its religious culture along Unitarian-Humanistic lines, so that these tragic spiritual conflicts between the understanding of truth and the attainment of other kinds of good are not precipitated in individual souls. It will be a long time before Presbyterians and Catholics become truly humanistic, but greater changes than that have in fact been wrought in human affairs slowly through past centuries. Santayana said that the Catholic Church will still be power in the community long after people have ceased to believe in God.

I tell my fellow Humanists that we have an 800-year project, and that we should not be impatient, but we ought to get started at least.

Let us admit that these theological problems about God, the supreme being, prayer, and immortality are not the most serious ones the world faces today. Those of war and peace, inflation and depression, economic injustice, and race conflict are more important. We must get workable solutions to them, if progress is to continue. But religious problems are also important. In order that the men who build peace, prosperity, and justice shall put forth their best effort, they must be at peace within their own souls. They must experience an inner spiritual harmony without deep frustrations. They must be adjusted to themselves, to their fellows, to the ideal, and to the universe. And let us distinguish all four of these. True religion will help those who build the future for mankind to make this quadruple adjustment.

Unitarianism, whether humanistically oriented or not, should commit itself to Federal World Government, Civil Liberties, Economic Justice, Planned Parenthood, Democracy, anti-totalitarianism, and the elimination of race prejudice. It should not sponsor either political party, or any specific candidate for office.

And it should at all times work for the long range goal of a religious cultural tradition which will help every enlightened human being to achieve that intellectual and spiritual integrity and serenity which are necessary for a true sense of well-being and happiness. With this, plus world peace and justice, man's creative energies would no longer be wasted in futile conflicts, but could be directed to truly great and productive work in industry, government, art, science, religion, education, and recreation, so that man could realize all of the grandeur and the glory that can pertain to this our earthly life—to this our human enterprise.

We can today strive toward the light of this ideal, and hope that future generations will come close to achieving it.

Peace and Truth Depend on Abundance

"None so blind as those who will not see."

Our own failures, faults, shortcomings have low visibility to us: our neighbors' to them.

Local self-interest, patriotism throw blankets of fog over our personal defects and those of our dear country. The same mists seem to magnify to us our neighbors' sins of omission and commission.

Scarcity, competition for the good things of life weave a magic spell over our perceptions of truth and righteousness. The classic example is the case where it all depended on "whose ox was gored." That story, and others like it, would make good sermons if the preachers realized the bad effects of individual and group self-interest on moral judgment.

By doing away with scarcity of goods, by creating a balance between production and need, these unfortunate vacillations of justice can be greatly reduced. When everyone can have all he wants of the good things of life, self-righteous activities of the rich to maintain their high standard of living will wither away. There will be no more poor people to covet their well-to-do neighbors' wealth and happiness.

Freedom from strife; willingness to share the good things of life; human peace, love, and friendship; all these goals of morality and religion can be reached through population control and plentiful production of all kinds of goods and services.

HERBERT STURGES.

Faith and Skepticism

BHABES CHANDRA CHAUDHURI

The Very Reverend Dean Inge—one of the topmost thinkers of this age—has often said that the root of our modern troubles is that people are losing faith or religion; by which is meant faith in God, faith in themselves and mankind, faith in the good or in ideals.

If faith, however, means believing things without adequate reasoning, deliberation or evidence, just because we wish to believe, or we are too mentally inert to look facts in the face, then the less of faith mankind has, the better! But if to avoid ambiguity faith may be taken to mean simply to have the courage to face up to any eventuality felt to be good, even when we have no certainty that we shall succeed, nor any clear understanding why good is good or how it makes a moral claim on us,—the more mankind has of this sort of "faith," the better. For is not faith in goodness reasonably justified if this means the conviction that goodness matters or the firm determination to act as though it mattered, whatever the consequence to oneself? Instances are not wanting when we have to call up "the courage of our convictions." Herein we have to act as though we believed, even when the evidence does not justify belief. A man who sees another drowning may feel bound to act as though he knew he could save him, even if he doubts his own powers of lifesaving in a rough sea. If this is "faith," should we not have more of it? But, curiously, people all too often fail to distinguish between behaving as though they believed and actual believing. And, so they say that, in some situations where evidence is lacking, we must have actual belief or else fail in courage. Now, of course, it seems to be easier to act boldly when one has an unreasoning confidence in the issue. But, surely, to face the situation with open eyes, and yet to act with courage, is more admirable than to attain a sham courage by blinding oneself to danger!

Bertrand Russell, on the other hand, has significantly said, in the *History of Western Philosophy,* "It is nobler to doubt than to believe." This is only a half-truth but it is a good antidote to the other half-truth, namely that faith is good in itself, and doubt bad. There appear to be two reasons for valuing doubts. First, it is more conscious than innocent credulity. People only begin to doubt when they are in a fix as to the evidence that appears to conflict with their assumption. Second, anybody who cares about intellectual honesty or rectitude naturally is less prone to jump at a conclusion, considering such a move as unjust and rash.

When we look around the world today, we find that in many directions a little less faith and a good deal more of the skeptical spirit would have spared mankind from major disasters. Think of the verdict of history on the morals of World War II and you will find, perhaps, that if the Germans had been less credulous, more cautious, and a bit skeptical they might have avoided being caught up in the false prophesies of the world-domination of Adolf Hitler! If the Russians, again, were more prone to doubt, they might be less ready to believe that dialectical materialism is a sufficient substitute for religion! And they might not be so naïve as to suppose that American civilization is about to crash. If the Americans had less faith in themselves and in the magic of unrestrained private enterprise, they might take steps to avoid the economic inflations—with concomitant evils. They might perhaps be even more wholehearted in their effort to save the other continents from starvation. If, again, some followers of Freud had been a little more cautious, they would not have mistaken the works of that great thinker for the gospel truth. If some scientists had been more skeptical of the power of natural science, many people might have escaped the loss of faith in the Homo sapiens. For some scientists brightly claimed that even the most developed human experience and behavior could be fully explained simply in terms of "instincts," or "reflexes" or "psycho-chemical ecstasies," and therefore they hold that personal love, art, science, philosophy, and all the finest things in life were at bottom mere animal reactions to stimuli! If some rationalists had been more skeptical about the scope and power of human reason itself, there would have been none of that doctrinaire and sophistic philosophy which, lacking grace and intellectuality, either offers sham rationalism of all the great mysteries or simply denies their existence. Similarly, if theologians and philosophers had been more skeptical as to the power of human intellect to invent new ideas about ultimate reality, the wars of religion and the orgies of holy persecutions might have been avoided to a great extent. Further, if we and our predecessors had not been so credulous as to believe the theologians and metaphysicians, who claimed that religion and morality need be founded on certain beliefs about the universe as a whole, we need not have stuck to the Scripture story of Creation or even the theory of a personal God, in order to justify our conviction that goodness matters; nor would those of us who finally surrendered these beliefs have been in danger of concluding that nothing matters but to have a good time. Finally, on the personal level, if John had been a little more skeptical about Jane's perfection, the flaws that inevitably appeared in her character after the honeymoon might not have shocked him into deserting her.

Ostensibly, there is a strong argument against skepticism. First, it is frequently said that skepticism is bad because it produces bad effects. Second, it is claimed that some of the most vital beliefs are basically irrational, and yet must be believed.

With regard to the evil effect of skepticism we are told that it lands in inertia and breeds irresponsibility. Only faith, they say can move mountains, and if we are to save civilization, many mountains must be moved. Skepticism, it is said, undermines belief in our sense of moral values, because this depends on faith in God as the basis of all goodness. The believer may, however, admit that some skeptics and atheists are virtuous, but this, he may say, is only because they have formed a moral habit as a result of religious upbringing and tradition. Their morality is then just a hangover from their professed religion, and has no sure foundation.

What answer is there to the charge that skepticism is bad, because of its bad effects?

The first point to say, is that if skepticism is in fact justified, we shall do no good by merely hushing it up, simply on the score of its bad effects. Sooner or later, the truth will out. And in the meantime, to live on sheer wishful thinking or on a lie, even a comforting or encouraging one, is injudicious. But are these charges against skepticism true? No doubt, people

who have been brought up to believe that morality depends on God may go to pieces when their faith in God is undercut; just as those who have been brought up to believe in hellfire as the supreme theological dictum may become morally irresponsible if they lose that belief.

But today many people manage to behave decently and even heroically without the fear of hell; and many others without belief in God.

The crux of the matter surely is that genuine morality involves an inner love for the good for its own sake, and acting rightly simply for its own sake; not for fear of punishment. Both the virtuous skeptic and the theist or the theologian do the good simply because they are possessed by a compelling vision of the good itself. And in the last resort the religious votary worships God because he believes God to be good, or that God wills good. As for the argument that the virtuous skeptic is virtuous simply through the practices of religious disciplines and rites, we may justly understand why religions like Christianity, Hinduism, or Taoism have been great forces in clarifying man's vision of goodness and morality since the dawn of civilization.

What, then, is it that survives the test and is supremely important?

Before trying to answer this question, we shall deal with the second kind of charge that the believers make against skepticism. Superficially it is like the statement that we have made about the limitations of skepticism, but really it is very different. Some things, it is said, are so important that one must believe in them even if the belief seems positively irrational. It is claimed that, when we look into these sublime beliefs, we discover that they are expressions, necessarily halting and self-contradictory because couched in feeble human language, of truths too deep for reasons; and that their very irrationality is a symptom of their truth. The attempt to undermine them intellectually, we are told, is due to a narrow or blind "intellectualism," an uncritical faith in human reason.

For instance, the skeptic may say that it is inconsistent to believe in a God who is a person and yet also "external" or "timeless"; for does not the word "person" essentially mean something which is or has a conscious life going on in time? The believer replies that this mystery is beyond the proper scope of reason, and that it is important to hang on to both these inconsistent attributes of God. Such statement obviously means nothing at all. So what is the good of making them? An objection may be raised. Even in science, inconsistent theories may be accepted for a special purpose, as judged by the Einstein Theory of Relativity against the Newtonian Concept of Space and Motion.

Similarly, with mutually inconsistent religious doctrines, if we are convinced that each is true in its special limited field can we not without violation of intellectual integrity use them both to serve the purpose of logical fictions? Some believers claim that the great systems of metaphysical speculation and religious doctrine should not be rejected merely for their logical incoherence, since they are expressions of a whole attitude of life founded on a lifetime of experience. They are true spiritually or poetically—if not logically.

This view surely rests on a confusion. Dante's *Divine Comedy* may be said to be true spiritually or allegorically in that it expresses an attitude to man and the universe which the sensitive reader is compelled to accept as in many ways emotionally adequate. But he is not, therefore, justified in believing Dante's account of the universe as a sphere of Seven Levels of Purgatory with Satan at the portal of Inferno and God outside all.

Allegorical or poetic fantasies do not always demand belief, but only a casual lull of disbelief. Metaphysical theories and dogmas, on the other hand, claim belief and must stand the test of criticism. Of course, the withholding of belief from a doctrine does not preclude the cherishing of its allegorical or "poetical truth." The story of the Passion Plays, or the Crucifixion, or paintings of Michaelangelo contains such a basis of truth, whether one believes it or not. Surely, the consistent and fully conscious behavior is to distinguish between belief and doubtful acceptance of an attitude and to appreciate the truth while maintaining rigorous intellectual agnosticism about "ultimate reality."

Yet, as we have said, mere skepticism is not enough. We desperately need some positive conviction to guide and inspire us. What, then, is the solution? First, we should be rationally skeptical as to all far-reaching theories about the nature of ultimate reality or the universe as a whole, for the simple reason that human intellect and indeed language itself are utterly incapable of forming reliable ideas on such a high plane of thought, or even of asking really significant questions. Nearly all the great questions have turned out to be false and unanswerable because misconceived. A simple example is the eternal question as to whether the earth was the center of the Universe, or the sun,—and its off-quoted answer: "Neither; for it has no center!" It is overwhelmingly probable that the questions as to whether there is a God or not, and whether we have immortal souls or not, are even further from being answerable because they are too delicate to be comprehensible. Skepticism on this loftiest plane of thought rules out alike all religious doctrine and all anti-religious dogmas, theism and atheism. On this plane strict agnosticism seems to be the way of integrity, both intellectual and spiritual. But this is not the last word in the matter. We have within our ordinary experience enough to transform us from mean little self-seekers to self-transcending servants of the only divine thing we can ever conceive; if only we will open our eyes and see it. And this is not a matter of faith but of positive will. Skeptical theories may claim to undermine it, but they cannot, because it is not something remote and unintelligible but something confronting us every day in our own lives and in the lives of our fellows. When we are really "awake," most clearly conscious, and not bemused by some trivial irrelevant obsession, such as a craving for security or power, or a gay time, we simply cannot but see and worship this thing, and strive to embody it in our life. Unfortunately we have no satisfactory name for it; and though we all know something of it, we easily misconceive it under the influence of theories, theological or scientific. It presents itself to us as an ideal, a way of life. It is the way of sensitive and intelligent awareness of the world and ourselves and each other, the way of love and fellowship, and self-outgrowing through service and sacrifice.

It is the way of devoted and coherent and creative action in the world for the advancement of this kind of quest after truth. One may call it "nous" after the Platonists; "Pneuma"—after St. Paul; the "Atman" according to the Hindu sages; the "Spirit" or "Tao" according to the Chinese Philosophers.

But can we blindly seek to call it an "Eternal Soul,"

"God," "Holy Ghost," or the like without precise realization? Surely, however much the atheist and the theist, the believer and the skeptic, the theologian and the metaphysicist may talk or argue about these, the uninitiated rationalist can only understand them very little beyond this—that without positive conviction to balance faith against skepticism there is no master key to unlock the mysteries in life!

My Humanism

WILLIAM YERINGTON

There are five or six humanisms in the world, divergent, externally from each other, like trees. But as of elm, oak, maple, fir, pine, and palm there is a common thing we call tree; so all humanisms are in reality one—different forms of the same idea or passion or demand—namely, that human exigency and human achieving should be paramount in all the occasions, all the parts of human adventure. Ancient humanism, which called man the measure of things; Renaissance humanism, with its mild revolt from excessive God-worship, and its will to Greek literature, Greek philosophy, Greek knowledge; Pragmatic humanism, judging ideas by experience, by their effect on life; Church humanism, that ignores the transcendental in its ardent concern for mankind; twentieth-century humanism, a repudiation of the Rousseauan philosophy which glorifies raw impulse, and the blatant body-worship rife today—all these apparently heterogeneous programs are one, identical in their demand for human exigency. If I enter the ambiguous war of ideas with a sixth definition, you can hardly censure me, or charge me with making confusion more confounded. What things *are* simple and homogeneous? Look at religion—a thousand churches, all with a unique formula, all very sure that religion resides in their special theology. Look at God—a thousand names and characters, from savage mumbo jumbo up to the spiritual universe of Goethe and Spinoza. Could there be a dizzier confusion of tongues?

Humanism I will define: the process of expanding and deepening awareness towards life, towards all the manifold parts of human enterprise—developing our humanity proper, as distinct from our animality. I do not mean asceticism, which denies the body but discipline, which magnetizes with mind our body hungers. One prophet attacks the supreme value of knowledge in culture. "The most uneducated peasant or factory-hand," wrote John Cowper Powys, "if he has developed an original and sensitive response to life, is more cultivated than many a college-bred professor." I think Powys wrong, deeply wrong; how can you respond to life unless you know it? Life includes everything—literature, science, art, music, religion, philosophy, no less than what your ignorant dayworker is aware of. The Humanist will not indeed be a bookish person; a few books are his—great, calm, eternal books; he goes very little with contemporary fashions, names and shibboleths—the urge for being modern, clever, intellectual, absent from his ingenuous heart. To know a few imperishable things will mean that the great rare souls of mankind, by osmosis or tranfusion, have passed into my soul. Every individual who has impregnated marble, iron, color, thought, clay, tone, or life with his male spirit—these become not mine, but Me, forever.

He who aspires toward the humanizing of heart and brain will remove all that stops life as it would flow into us through our senses and our minds. Egoism: Hardly can selfish people know life in all her wealth, for they never listen. Humility and listening are two words for the same thing. He who stands before a great picture must be humble, must open himself to the picture's charm and meaning. I know people who cannot learn, who cannot grow; they never abandon themselves to the influences. And Ambition: the noise, hurry, fluster, and blank busyness of this hagridden century must be exchanged for an open-hearted, frank reception, and a peace which passeth understanding. Not quiescence, but peace, the peace of great rivers that in their quiet strength give power to a thousand mills; of silent suns flooding a universe with light. Wise men have always counseled poverty. No one hears life while eager and intent upon things and properties. The beauty of existence cannot stream on the excited brain, with its multitude of petty concerns. But the simple heart is a clear channel for God's power and radiance. The plain fact—we allow things to take the place of soul; and things have horribly failed us. Comfort: The world is too soft; how can I expect a thrill, when I touch life? Think of the pioneers, and the tough character they developed through hardship. No wonder we are cynics, pessimists, futilitarians; we seldom taste the heady liquor of being alive. No wonder men this day find existence bitter, rancid, or tasteless. If you seek one with a zest for life, go to the Independent, who lives on the edge of things, with circumstance, or fate, or the stars against him; whose day is hard and perilous. We are safe, smug, soft in our fetid paradise of comfort, our mechanical utopia—right for dolls; but men who wish to become persons need a half-wild universe, a perilous, hard, sinful universe.

Humanism: the ripe heart, the universal heart. Your Primitive has a full range of instincts or appetites; but these are ungrown, embryonic, and must be ripened. Nothing save a long exposure to the noble traditions of thought, knowledge, beauty, and good can give equipoise, completion, harmony. But the way to excellence indeed is long and hard—too long and hard for indolent souls. Universal men are alive in all their being—sense, nerve, brain, heart, and spirit. Old age must be unendurable in those who have no spiritual bank reserve to draw upon. But for Browning's wealthy soul, age was exciting and joyful.

Growth, Peace, Equipoise, Liberation, Happiness! Provincial minds are stiff—cannot change their traditions and patterns; have no elasticity, no power of response. They clamp down upon a meaning or idea, and nothing can alter them. They carry through life the same set of prejudices, the same phrases and meanings. The mature man has a new philosophy, a new religion, a new code, every day. Words and concepts go on expanding for him to the end. In the vertigo of life

he keeps a great serenity, anchorage upon things which endure. Eternal traditions are like the vital earth into which a wise tree sends deep friendly roots. We must be rooted in a noble past; thence we get sap and stability. Immature people fluctuate; life is torn and ravelled to bits, has no integrity or direction. A mob yielding to every wind of emotion, swept by raucous demagogues or newspapers into war, chaos, destruction. Long acquaintance with serene masters of beauty and knowledge must be stabilizing—the accumulated sanity, the collective insight and wisdom of ages. Thus ordinary people rise to conformity with sovereign minds. The universal man has forgotten himself—and remembered Himself. The little nagging worries, the fears, jealousies, and selfish desires that make us unhappy do not exist for him. He moves in joy because he moves in humility—he moves in God. Amid the blare and rush, the maddening complexness of this world, he maintains the old beautiful simplicity. An imagination that pierces down beneath all the ruck and whirl and sham that make our life a thing of shreds and patches; and rests upon reality—a great wise instinctive being—calm, poised, happy, aware, beautiful, since God lives in him; he is the Spiritual Man—spiritual because completely human. We celebrate the two-hundredth anniversary of his birth. I salute him, the great Exemplar of my truth—and call him Goethe.

I close with a personal prejudice. The most effectual agent of humanization may well be literature. I said in the beginning: Through great books the rare souls of mankind, by osmosis or transfusion, will pass into your soul. That high uncompromising valor of Milton; Wordsworth's noble primitivity, his feeling for the divineness of earth and sky; the sense of great horizons and mountain altitudes which we call Emerson; the way Thoreau savors life, a wonderful newness, an eternal beginning; Carlyle's conviction that all things are supernatural; the clairvoyance Shakespeare had for men and women, their laughter and tears, joy and pain, hope and despair; Greek drama—its realization of the whole divine heroic tragedy, life; these fine essences flow into the minds of all who love enduring books and mould their fundamental nerve patterns, their instinctive reaction to the world. Since poems open our eyes, ears, brain, and heart to the manifold interestingness of life, great poems multiply our ways of being happy. Primitives are indeed happy. The animal satisfactions, love and friendship, elemental joy of sight and hearing, a few primary pleasures of mind or spirit are indeed theirs. Universal men have all the primitive ecstasies and a myriad more; they live numberless thrilling responses that undeveloped people experience only in the feeblest pulsations. Their world is incomparably greater and richer; their brain, nerve, imagination more alive, more sensitive, more vivid in response. Universal men are quickened in all their being; they have not only the *poems* of Wordsworth to enjoy—the *eyes* of Wordsworth are become theirs. The unique sense of life, the power, the appetite and aspiration, that make all greatness in poetry, music, science, thought or action, have changed the very form of their experience, like mountain air, like sunlight, working a miracle in our veins. Humanism I now define: A growth whereby common souls achieve the quality of uncommon souls, whereby all inherit the excellence a few have won.

Religion I define: Trust in the Spirit. And since we know the human spirit, and the oversoul, if there be an oversoul, religion becomes almost identical with Humanism. Faith in the spirit against the engulfing materiality of our age, which declares a bond more important than a bible. O yes, we quote, "Man does not live by bread alone"; "What doth it advantage you if you gain the world and lose yourself?"—with a hundred other golden proverbs from the bibles and poems; and then go out, exhibiting ardent will to own the world and let the spirit die. Materialism sits in our churches and prays; goes to college and scatters deadly virus there: Education is now dying of the contagion. It is an epidemic, a medieval pestilence. Humanism, which four hundred years ago stood against otherworldliness, now stands against worldliness. Until you would rather have riches of personality than riches of property; until you can say with inner saying: Must I choose a truth which will bring disgrace and poverty, or a prosperous orthodoxy? give me truth; if I would not prefer God without gold to gold without God, or the unattainable perfection to what men call success—our presence in college, temple, church, and synagogue is a hoary, damning lie. How many times I hear the argument—wherefore squander my brief day for these intangible goods of the inner life (good which may perish with my body) when I could enjoy the certain, immediate good the world offers? I have no logical answer; that is where faith comes in. If you rationally establish faith, it becomes knowledge, and no longer can be called faith; religion takes on the quality of a commercial exchange. Venture, hazard, gamble—these are faith, confidence that somehow in the unwritten drama of existence, wealth of heart and brain are indeed worth divinely more than all the immediate and alluring prosperities of time. And why not a commercial exchange? Why must religion be grounded upon faith and uncertainty? Because knowledge would prevent a real heroic choice; if I *knew* the rewards of the spirit, I should be compelled by that knowledge, free will nothing but a word. When you know the cup a poison, to drink is no more possible than for water to run up grade. Knowledge compels, abrogates choice. And a commercial exchange has the taint of egoism. Give us men, like Bertrand Russell, who believe that life cares nothing for the pure in heart and our soul cannot survive the body; yet live, with incessant courage and enthusiasm, for the soul. Many years I had a strong, unexplained feeling against the immortality-hope. There is in all such forward-looking a large admixture of greed. It makes virtue something we are paid for. You never can ask anytthing of a good act; the reward is having done it. One may judge a man's growth by the morality, not of will, but of impulse. *Has* he virtue, or *is* he virtue? Until I love righteousness with poetic ardor, as a poet loves creating the poem; until I do good for the joy of it—I am yet a moral baby. I think Shelley (I regret his aberration) had more grace in him than all the God-worshipping, knee-bending, law-abiding millions, in church and out. He loved justice and truth—was enamored of them, as you adore The Woman.

Heat, with finer vibration, becomes light; so life has attained to consciousness. By humanization, we grow more and more like the heart of God. God is a feeble name for world-consciousness. So we enter into our heritage of Humanity—the accumulated feeling, knowledge, and wisdom of all ages. Awareness enlarged, vivified, responsive—enlarged by absorbing life's wonderful variety; a focus where the light of heaven is concentrated, responsive like fine clay to the impress of new knowledge, new wisdom and beauty—a mind curious, inquiring, supple, an ascending life.

The Problem of Evil

LEO HIRSCH

Why should there be evil in the world? Why should there exist evil impulses in the human heart? Why should the world be the playground of good and evil forces? We know that there is kindness on this planet but there is also cruelty. The important question is: what can we do about it? Criminologists tell us that many a person commits evil and does it deliberately, knowing that it is evil; that the most wicked crimes are committed with a full realization of the horrible consequences to the victim.

Man, from the time he attained reason and conscience, was deeply concerned with the problem of evil. All the old scriptures have remarkable examples of how seriously man probed and studied this problem and tried not only to find an answer to that riddle but what humans could do about it.

The classic tragedy of Job is an outstanding portrayal of a man who suffered all the tortures of physical pain, loss of material treasures, and the pain of spiritual confusion and instability. He could not understand the loss of health, of his earthly goods, and the loss of children and friends. Job, as interpreted by orthodox thinkers, is a man who was tormented by Satan at God's behest, so that he would learn something about life and, in the end, be rewarded for his suffering. There are passages in the Book of Job that go deep into the soul because they express with magnificent finality thoughts about evil that have always harassed the mind. During his anguish he cursed the day of his birth and complained of life in general. It was not until he clearly realized the challenge of evil, accepted life with all its conditions and responsibilities in a spirit of humility and reverence that he was able to emerge into a state of wisdom and faith.

Christ gave us new insights in regard to evil in man's nature. Christ warns his disciples to be humble and harmless; to avoid offenses and not to despise little offenses. He taught them how to deal with offenders when they offend us and how to forgive them. To him, forgiveness was a supreme virtue.

There is nothing more despicable than the evil displayed by a person who deliberately and coldly betrays his country or a benefactor or a friend.

Much of evil in man's nature can be explained by a lack of development of his spiritual faculty. When man will be granted the fullest freedom of thought and expression and equal opportunity in his political and economic life, then much of that recalcitrant nature will be eliminated.

Euripides, the great Athenian dramatist, wrote tragedy because he saw the eternal conflict between good and evil in the lives of men. He expressed his faith in man by his belief that man in the very nature of his being had the ability to conquer the evil in his breast. In probably one of his greatest choruses he symbolized that faith by "the appletree, the sunshine, and the gold."

In all periods of great crises, evil is brought to the surface and becomes more violent. We see cruel types of characters and situations, human and social relations, which appear abnormal and subhuman. These events and the men who dominate them generally end in catastrophe.

Men of genius and spiritual insight who lived in these soul-trying times invariably made some contribution to bolster the morale of mankind.

The finest minds in every period of man's life on this planet were concerned with the problem of evil and bore a kind of prophetic relation to the situation of the time. These spiritually minded men recognized as clearly as we do that at times evils multiply in our world and threaten from moment to moment to engulf us—the evils of violence, tyranny, persecution, hatred, bigotry, lust.

From this we may readily infer that the moral order, as we know it, was not revealed to man as the myths of religion declare. Man found his way to the moral order haltingly, by the stern method of trial and error. He discovered through his experience that there are lines of conduct which are good insofar as they made for health, happiness, and life, and other lines of conduct which are evil insofar as they create disease, disintegration, despair, and death. It is through trial and error, through infinite painful experience, that we have learned the intrinsic importance of the individual, of human dignity, the conception of human freedom, the conception of spiritual and moral values. From these hard-won concepts, we have learned that evil in its ethical meaning is to offend against the worth attached to human beings. To deny this worth in man is to deny religion, democracy, and the moral law.

The moral law in the spiritual world, like the law of gravitation in the physical world, is the law which reigns throughout the spiritual universe and is universal in its jurisdiction. Our duty as human beings is to apply more and more the universal spiritual law in our human relations and thus enlarge our destiny and our culture.

In the United States there have been many leaders who were deeply concerned with the problem of evil. Some attacked evil in the religious field and some attacked evil in the political and economic areas. Such men as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Theodore Parker, William Ellery Channing, Wendell Phillips, Lincoln, Hawthorne, Henry George, Veblen, and others made valuable contributions to this perplexing problem. Phillips and Lincoln had a profound influence in destroying the institution of slavery. Henry George, through his *Progress and Poverty*, left an indelible impression on the American mind for the need to remove poverty from the democratic scene.

Then, too, we must not forget Herman Melville. In *Moby Dick*, Melville took the problem of evil and placed it within the environment of nature and within the framework of industry. He recognized that there were certain cruelties in nature that disregarded the worth in man and that there were certain dictatorial types of men in industry that made of human relations a hollow mockery.

As against these positive forces that have combated evil, America has produced a paradoxical religious movement which denies the very existence of evil. I refer to the Christian Science Movement whose central thesis is that sin does not exist, that there is no such thing really as moral evil, that moral evil, too, like bodily disease, is mere appearance, a mere illusion,

and that it, too, can be expunged by stout negation. The same position which the mental healer takes with regard to sickness he likewise takes with regard to sin or moral evil.

If this faith were to spread, it would prevent the mitigation of moral evil in the world, just as their attitude toward disease would prevent the possible cure of physical ills. We ought to recognize that just as there is a medical science based on the assumption that physical disease has physical causes and that these causes may be known and understood, so there is a moral science based on the conviction that moral evil has causes and that by scientific investigation these causes may be ascertained and thus removed. The mental healing method would lead to the abandonment of the medical profession as well as of the social sciences, and to the ignoring of this causal side and it would hinder the most important efforts that can be made for the moral betterment of the world. It is not right to say that moral evil does not exist. Moral evil does exist; it is real, as matter is real, and you cannot get rid of it by denying it.

The cure of the evils of the world, the evils of the slums and poverty, racial discriminations, the religious bigotries, the hatreds, the lies, and cruelties cannot be achieved by denying their existence. The Christian Science Movement denies what to me is undeniable: that matter is real and that moral evil is real, and hence all such religious movements are socially dangerous, unproductive, and sterile on the side of social reform and impede human progress.

We live today in a period which has much in common with the Dark Ages—with its chaos, ceaseless wars, its nightmarish fears, its unbelievable cruelties, its horrible bigotries, its homeless men, women, and children. In one respect we surpass the horrors of the Dark Ages because man has succeeded in creating the most fiendish weapon of destruction in the history of man. It is therefore of the greatest importance to know and understand who generated the enmity, the hostility that poisons the atmosphere in which we live and is deliberately aimed to destroy the democratic way of life that has been won over a long period of time and at tremendous suffering and sacrifice.

The defiant, self-proclaimed enemy thus far has been the Soviet Communist party. Under Stalin's regime, he was the supreme, absolute ruler, and the Politburo was the principal source and channel of the decisions which demanded and commanded the blind obedience of the hard core of loyal Communist Party members everywhere in the world. These Communists have absolute despotic political power in Russia and in other parts of the world through their fifth columns. Their method and technique thus far to achieve world domination have been fraud, terrorism, violence, the big lies, and any other diabolical means to promote their ends. Stalin's recent death brought a new dictator into power, viz., Malenkov. He and his advisors have decided on a new course and a new strategy. They have launched new peace gestures. Are they sincere? We have to take these peace gestures at their face value until we ascertain what they mean by them. To the writer they seem to be booby traps deliberately set so as to lull the democratic peoples into a sense of security and thus entice them to lower their guard, decrease their defense measures and their aid to the allies, and thus create a world-wide economic depression that will enable the Russians to deal a death blow. A leopard cannot change his spots and Communism will not overnight change its plans to destroy democracy. The Russians are the victims of their dogmatisms, their cruelties, their crusading fanaticisms, and these cannot be shed easily. The habit of men's indoctrinated minds is not easily changed and overturned. Nothing short of a cataclysmic upheaval from within can bring about the drastic changes that will bring world peace.

Soviet Russia is our enemy without. Within our nation we have plenty of enemies who threaten to destroy our way of life by ignoring individual rights and concentrating their activities mainly on material privileges and profits.

In the recent steel strike, we have had evidence of the power of these disintegrating and disorganizing elements. They showed a complete indifference to our boys fighting in Korea, to the stability of our economic structure and to the welfare of our citizenry. From the very beginning, it was known that the major issue in the strike was the price of steel. Management for months pressured the government and its stabilization agencies to accede to industry's demands for higher prices, regardless of the fact that the increase they demanded would let loose another spiral of inflation. They cared little what effect such a strike would have on our economy and our defense program.

Management also created the false issue of the union shop. The union shop was the issue on which the steel magnates chose to hold ground until they had received the assurance of higher prices. Labor and government fell into this trap.

Labor, too, is not entirely guiltless; they, too, ignored the rights of millions of other workers by forcing them into unemployment. They, too, were indifferent to the survival of our economy or the welfare of our soldiers. They could have passed up their demand for the recognition of the union shop until a calmer and more favorable atmosphere prevailed. So the steel strike was lost by labor, by the government, and by the consumers, and won by the superior power and shrewdness of the steel magnates.

As long as labor and management distrust one another, so long will collective bargaining fly out of the window. Labor through its economists realizes that management is opposed to labor organizations and is unwilling to have labor accountants or government accountants go over their books to reveal to stockholders, workers, and government the exact situation so as to be able to determine profits, prices, and wages. As long as all accountants are not placed under government license, so long will accountants fail to abide by ethical standards. Prices, wages, and profits must always be in equilibrium. When profits are made paramount at the expense of wages and prices, so long will you have strikes and discord. The same applies to labor when it demands a wage at the expense of fair profits and the additional cost to consumers. Human relations must be made the paramount issue.

A democratic labor organization must repudiate its right to paralyze a whole industry and the entire nation by coercive measures. The paralyzing power now exercised by the union should not be possessed by any minority group. That holds true with management as well. In a democracy, ownership and management must not be permitted to paralyze the entire industry because it is determined to force labor to accept its arbitrary decree. In the final judgment, the 160 million Americans ought to decide what is right or wrong in

industrial relations.

The democratic idea demands that we distrust great power, whether of an overwhelming majority or an aggressive minority, or the power of an overwhelming concentration of wealth. The democratic idea demands that justice must be the basis of the good life. Enlightened Americans recognize that a new era in industry must replace the traditional conflicts of the past; that strikes and ceaseless warfare must be replaced by coöperation and teamwork.

Strength does not come from physical capacity or material power. It comes from an indomitable spiritual will to do the right. The spirit lies dormant in the brute, and he knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law—to the strength of the spirit. It is this permanent, spiritual element in human nature which counts no cost too great in order to find full ethical expression in our human relations. It is because Soviet Russia recognizes no such spiritual nature in man that it completely ignores moral law. To them the material world is primary. To them individuals have no inalienable rights, and the individual personality has no sacredness. Dictatorship in the modern world is a monstrous, hideous evil, whether it resides in the Politburo or in industrial management or in undemocratic labor organizations. Dictatorship rests on a sea of blood, an ocean of tears, and a world of suffering. How can fear, force, lies, and misery make a better world? Morality consists, above all, in respect for means, man, and truth.

Another enemy within our borders is the racist, the isolationist, the hater of a foreign people. This enemy respects neither law nor life. He rejoices in seeing people of different color segregated and compelled to accept low standards of living. He fails to recognize the sacredness of human life and its interdependence. Such individuals cannot by any stretch of the imagination be Americans or internationalists or advocates of world government based on law.

To state these evils does not mean that we must become pessimistic or fatalistic or to assume that nothing can be done about them. In a world where "cold" war is exterminating human liberty and where "hot" war might be waged with atomic bombs, fatalism or complacency is criminal. The recognition of these evils should act as a challenge to urge us to the utmost effort to counter and control them.

To meet Soviet Russia's challenge, we must become and remain militarily strong and at the same time have faith in our spiritual resources and work with the utmost dedication to strengthen the United Nations.

At present, we are aiming at an intensive preparedness to meet the emergency and then hoping to relax that effort. It seems to me that it would be wiser to have a military program that could be maintained indefinitely without in any way undermining our economy or our basic freedoms. All this does not mean a third World War but it does mean convincing Soviet Russia that a third World War could not be won by anyone; that it is beyond the strength of any nation to conquer, subjugate, and annex the entire world; and that such an attempt would only mean the annihilation of the civilized world.

Russia's political rulers are deadly afraid of the spread of the democratic idea among her people, and they need the constant prodding of the U.N. to aid them to do away with totalitarianism; and we of the democratic West need to see ourselves in the false and exaggerated eyes of the Russians to keep us up to the mark of our democratic ideals.

So, in the final analysis, evil, whether on the international or domestic scene, is the compelling force that challenges us to create finer human beings and thus build a nobler civilization. To the individual, evil is a foil that develops and sharpens his moral fibre, his spiritual nature. Good affirms itself through evil.

It has been said that man is born into trouble, as the sparks fly upward. Humans are so constructed that they cannot grow and develop without suffering, without sorrow and frustration, without the challenge of evil.

Man's effort to overcome evil with good is simply an effort to project the infinite into the finite; an attempt to substitute the perfect for the imperfect; an attempt to fulfill the moral law and thus to carry out the spiritual relations in finite terms. The spiritual gains thus achieved are incalculable and make way for spiritual freedom.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 66)

beliefs that Communism will win out over capitalism or democratic socialism; but it does mean a definite, if temporary, abandonment of war and force on the international level. Having come to that conclusion, and having seen what a mare's nest of unrest was stirred up by Stalin in the Soviet lands, Russian methods of diplomacy have gone back to those which prevailed at an earlier period, the aim being a peaceful accommodation. There must be internal reconstruction, and East Germany in particular must be strengthened, for this key area is weak in manpower and woefully lagging in industrial production.

In the United States, the change of policy came about (1) through a recognition of the change in Moscow; (2) through pre-election polls, Nixon's failure to swing key districts by his extremism, and the way the election went, all of which convinced the President that he can now stand up to the war hawks and must do so to satisfy public opinion.

One big test of the new policy will be China. Behind the McCarthy, Dirksen, Jenner, Welker, and Knowland attacks on the Administration is sheer desperation lest the old issue of Communist China's recognition be put in a new light by the fading of their beloved Chiang Kai-shek. Efforts to persuade Chiang not to provoke Red Chinese attacks that go closer to Formosa than the coastal islands (some of which are 300 or more miles away from Chiang) simply infuriated the whole China Lobby. The immediate test will come over the place where Washington draws the line. It will help Chiang defend Formosa. Will it become embroiled by defending far-off, tiny islands which are clearly Red China's more than Chiang's, and virtually parts of the mainland?

Another test will still come over Germany. Once West Germany is armed, and economically powerful, it can demand many things of many nations. The United States will then have less to offer than today. Russia, however, can offer the coveted eastern territories. Negotiation may yet produce incredible changes in the European set-up.

—Devere Allen,
Worldover Press.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

QUOTABLE QUOTES

Rockford, Illinois

"One member has said that his season for church going begins with the first Sunday in January and continues into golfing season. It goes against my grain to admonish people to attend church. I believe they should come because they like to and because they are convinced that church attendance is essential to depth and delight in living. In the language of business, we must 'sell' the product because we have confidence in it.

"One of my selling points for church attendance is that, like attending school, we learn even we might have preferred to do something else. We build on the weekly accumulation of religious knowledge and inspiration our fellowship brings.

"The liberal's belief that character comes through effort implies the initiative of attendance at services which bring strength that no man can muster in isolation. 'No man is an island.' Our individual convictions must be tested and shared in community. It's a new year, a new beginning. Let's make the most of it."

Victor Goff.

St. Louis, Missouri

"Man's beliefs must plunge to the depth of his life and reach out for him to procure the greatest fullness. Precision can only be the end product which we shall know when we reach the perfect life in the perfect world. The delusion of preciseness can only frustrate our progress in this imperfect world. We move by formulation and reformulation of what we know in a slow ascent to the fullness of life and the revelation and fulfillment of our being.

"This is the integrital church. It is a church that teaches truth in so far as man knows what truth is; a church that embodies beauty in all its forms; a church that leads men toward whatever is spiritual in the world and speaks with a divine authority. All this is a far cry from a church that is merely 'free.' A church to be a church in any real sense of the word must have a principle of organism, even when liberty of thought and expression is one of its central tenets."

Thaddeus B. Clark.

Detroit, Michigan

"How does the liberal minister think about himself and his relationships to his parishioners? Certainly he does not think of himself as a miracle man or as a man set apart. If he thinks of himself in any special sense at all it is perhaps as one who had made his specialty the interpretation of human life in terms of values.

"One flippant young thing came up to the minister the other day and said, 'There is one point in my religion. I don't believe in going to church.' That's like going up to a professional pianist, and saying, 'You know, I don't think much of the piano as a musical instrument.'

"A minister is one who believes that the church exists, and that man needs something like a church, to hold before him and to train him in the importance of interpreting life in terms of values. That to the liberal, is what religion is, the exaltation of human-values in the affairs of life. The liberal minister is one who believes this function to be so important that he wants to spend all his energies in its promotion.

"A church, you see, is a research project in human living. It has been said over and over again, that what a minister turns out to be is largely the result of what his church is. If the church is full of men and women sensitive to their need for a boost and an uplift to the human spirit, and discerning enough to want to be associated with other men and women in the important business of cultivating the spirit of good will in human life, then a church can indeed be a research project in human living, and minister and people together can take part in a spiritual adventure, thrilling, exciting, rewarding, and deeply significant to people, to life, and to society."

Tracy M. Pullman.

St. Paul, Minnesota

"The liberal who is not a 'lukewarmite' is a man of large beliefs, of commanding loyalties; and these beliefs are not smaller, nor any less commanding because he finds his ultimate authority within himself, rather than in Papal Bull or Holy Writ. The freedom of the liberal is not to believe as he pleases; it is freedom to follow wherever the evidence may lead, to go wherever the search for truth takes him."

Arthur Foote.

Kansas City, Missouri

"Religion has always urged and demanded a loyalty to certain values. At times when the other-worldly pull has been supreme, some of these values have lost their brilliance and sunk to obscurity. In the main, however, religion has demanded patience, forbearance, courage, and consecration. These are some of the virtues out of which human life has made itself significant. To visualize a world in which they are to be put aside is to undermine the importance and validity of the ethical life. It is heresy against humanity to elicit patience in men without the awareness that patience may involve suffering, to seek the devotion of men to high causes without recognizing that even noble causes fail, are covered by the years, and even lost. Part of the discipline of life is to know that patience and devotion are called for whether they find fullfilment or not."

Raymond B. Bragg.

Grosse Pointe, Michigan

"Our inventiveness and technological prowess have made us *in fact* the most revolutionary nation on earth. But we are singularly backward about the social, political, economic, philosophical, and religious adjustments necessary to keep life meaningful in the new world we are so rapidly creating."

William D. Hammond.

Louisville, Kentucky

"You cannot shut out the turmoil of the world. You cannot build walls high enough nor insulation thick enough to hold it away. You can neither draw an iron curtain nor a spiritual curtain between yourself and the agony of man. I, too, would prefer to avoid controversy, but with Jeremiah I must say there is a burning in my bones that drives me to speak out when

I would rather be still; that calls me back from the comfort of my home and study to face the anguish of a man or men in grief; to face in compassion the anguish of a man whose folly has engulfed him; to face, indeed, our social difficulties and speak out. The error, I think, is in failing to see that there is a higher spirit than that of controversy in which to face the problem. God has a word for every human trial. That word is love."

Robert T. Weston.

Quincy, Illinois

"Perhaps it is inevitable in religion that the living fire of that religion often gets buried in the dead ashes of organization and finances. Certainly all the various branches of Christianity have gone through this process. Sometimes it appears that all that is left is the ashes. Sometimes it is the ashes that are venerated, that are the object of all the work and attention of the members of the church."

Thomas Maloney.

South Bend, Indiana

"When people find it difficult to face the realities of their world, they tend to make compromises or changes. In general, these are the 'changes' you can attempt to make:

1. Disregard the real world and create an imaginary world in which you can live with comfort. You can do this by creating stereotypes of all sorts.
2. Take to the bottle and 'change' yourself. The alcoholic finds a great stimulus from the contents of the bottle and where he never had courage before, he suddenly discovers it.
3. If you cannot 'change' your world or yourself, then respond to the neon sign: 'Jesus Saves.' This is the formula which is being offered to many as a form of salvation.

"We hasten to suggest, however, that none of these compromises will really work and we do not recommend that you try them. We need to learn to live with ourselves. We need to learn to live in a real world. Religion must help us to do that."

Erwin A. Gaede.

Chicago, Illinois

"It matters what we teach in church school and how we teach it. It matters what we believe about the child and about his needs. It matters what we as adults think unimportant and what we think important in religion and life. It matters how we conceive of religion, and what we think to be the true purpose of a church. It is a good thing sometimes that men do not hold certain of their narrower beliefs too uncompromisingly. Yet it is the shame of many of us that we do not take our more vital beliefs more seriously than we do. Indeed one can hardly be said to believe something which he fails to take seriously. It matters what we believe."

Vincent B. Silliman.

Chicago, Illinois

"We see to it that our cows and dogs and horses have peace of mind; but they serve us best that way. We do not expect them to make a living, or to compose music, or to solve difficult intellectual problems, or to pay taxes or to worry about their sins. Our situation is vastly different, however, by contrast, and we are the poorest people in the world if we think that perennial, undisturbed serenity of mind and heart is the ultimate and final good."

Edwin T. Buehrer.

Indianapolis, Indiana

"Few historical American figures more poignantly demonstrate the need for fair play than Thomas Paine. The tragic treatment he received toward the end of his life painfully illustrates how the democratic way of life requires the natural growth of both intelligence and sympathy in its citizens. And this in turn implies the constant re-evaluation of religious belief so that religion, as T. V. Smith expresses it, 'will celebrate at any given time the most that men know, not the least; and the best that men feel, not the worst.'

"What calls itself religion, but refuses to others that which it claims for itself is what Paine called irreligion. We agree with him most heartily. Whether in the name of God, or Jesus, or patriotism, or whatever, those who arrogate to themselves what they deny to others, do not understand the rudimentary virtue of fair play. We must practice democracy in spite of them."

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.

NEW FELLOWSHIPS

Within one week five applications for recognition as new fellowships came to the Conference office. They are Grand Forks, North Dakota; Hibbing, Minnesota; Terra Haute, Indiana; Battle Creek, Michigan and Sauk City, Wisconsin.

SAUK CITY

The Free Congregation of Sauk City was founded in 1852. It has been an independent religious society for 102 years. At their annual meeting in January they voted to affiliate with the American Unitarian Association and the Western Unitarian Conference.

DEDICATION

The First Unitarian Church of Sioux City held a dedicatory service for its new chapel on Wednesday, January 26. Out of town participants included Victor R. Seymour, Lincoln, President of the Iowa-Nebraska Conference, Randall S. Hilton, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference; and Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association.

DES MOINES, IOWA

The congregation of the First Unitarian Church of Des Moines has voted to sell their property at 11th and High Streets. A new site is under consideration on which they will build during the next 18 months.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE

Founded in 1905, the Abraham Lincoln Centre celebrated its 50th Anniversary on February 12th. Mrs. Helen Rosenfels, a member of the original All Souls Church and who has been connected with the Centre during its entire 50 years and has served as its Treasurer since 1932, gave a brief history of its activities and contribution. Mr. Philleo Nash, Chief Advisor on Racial Affairs to the White House during the Truman administration, gave the address. The celebration was presided over by Curtis W. Reese, Dean of the Centre. Dr. Reese has been affiliated with the Centre for 32 years and has been its executive and administrative officer since 1926. Dr. Reese has also served the Western Unitarian Conference as its Executive Secretary, President, and at present is its Treasurer.

ANNUAL MEETING

The next annual meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference will be held in Des Moines, Iowa, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, April 22, 23, 24, 1955.